

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION
11

12 HENRY JIMENEZ, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 INSTATE LATH & PLASTER, INC.,

16 Defendant.

Case No.: C 10-5177 PSG

**ORDER CONTINUING CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND
SETTING DEADLINE FOR PARTIES
EITHER TO FILE WRITTEN
CONSENT TO THE JURISDICTION
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE OR
TO REQUEST REASSIGNMENT TO A
DISTRICT JUDGE**

17 The initial case management conference in this case is set for January 25, 2011, and the
18 deadline for filing a case management statement was January 18, 2011. *See* ADR Scheduling Order.
19 As a result, the parties were required either to file written consent to the jurisdiction of the
20 magistrate judge or to request reassignment to a district judge, no later than January 18, 2011. *See*
21 Civ. L. R. 73-1(a)(1). The parties have neither consented nor requested reassignment.

22 Plaintiff filed a short Case Management Conference Statement on January 18, 2011
23 requesting the case management conference be continued to March 29, 2011 because the case is in
24 the process of settling. Plaintiff, however, provides no explanation as to why setting a trial schedule
25 should be postponed for two months.

26 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that no later than January 25, 2011, the parties shall either file
27 written consent to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge or request reassignment to a district
28 judge.

ORDER

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the case management conference is continued to
2 February 1, 2011 at 2 p.m.

3 Dated: January 20, 2011
4

5 
6 PAUL S. GREWAL
7 United States Magistrate Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER